

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)

Implementation of the Pay)
Telephone Reclassification and)
Compensation Provisions of the)
Telecommunications Act of 1996)

CC Docket No. 96-128

CC Docket No. 91-388

RECEIVED

JAN 17 1997

AT&T'S REPLY COMMENTS ON AMERITECH'S
COMPARABLY EFFICIENT INTERCONNECTION PLAN

Pursuant to the Commission's Public Notice released December 4, 1996,¹ AT&T Corp. ("AT&T") hereby submits these reply comments on Ameritech's comparably efficient interconnection ("CEI") plan for payphone service providers.² Although only a few comments were submitted,³ all concur that Ameritech's CEI plan fails to set forth all

¹ Pleading Cycle Established for Comments on Ameritech's Comparably Efficient Interconnection Plan for Payphone Service Providers, Public Notice, CC Docket No. 96-128, DA 96-2025, released December 4, 1996.

² The Commission required the Bell Operating Companies ("BOCs") to file CEI plans in Implementation of the Pay Telephone Reclassification and Compensation Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Report and Order, FCC 96-388, released September 20, 1996 ("Payphone Order"); and Order on Reconsideration, FCC 96-349, released November 8, 1996 ("Reconsideration Order").

³ Comments were filed by Inmate Calling Service Providers Coalition ("ICSPC"), American Public Communications Council ("APCC"), Great Lakes Public Communications Regional Coalition ("Great Lakes"), and AT&T.

the information required by the Payphone Order.⁴ Specifically, the CEI plan must demonstrate that Ameritech complies with the Computer III nonstructural separation requirements for the provision of payphone services,⁵ and with the complementary statutory mandate that Ameritech "not subsidize its payphone service . . . from its telephone exchange service . . . ; and [it does] not prefer or discriminate in favor of its payphone services."⁶ The plan's deficiencies thus raise the very concerns that the CEI requirements are designed to avoid. The comments consequently establish that, unless clarified and modified, the plan cannot be approved.

For example, ICSPC concurs with AT&T (2-3) that Ameritech's CEI plan fails to explain what network support, if any, is being provided to Ameritech's inmate calling service. Indeed, ICSPC (p. 2) correctly describes the plan as "so vague with respect to inmate calling services that the Commission (and interested parties) cannot evaluate

⁴ See Payphone Order at paras. 199-207.

⁵ See Amendment of Section 64.702 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations (Computer Inquiry III), Report and Order, 104 F.C.C.2d 958 (1986).

⁶ Section 276(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 U.S.C. § 276(a).

whether the Commission's nondiscrimination requirements will be met." Without a detailed description of Ameritech's inmate calling services, there is no way to ensure that Ameritech is not favoring its affiliated inmate payphones or disfavoring the inmate payphones of other providers. Therefore, the Commission must require Ameritech to set forth expressly in its CEI plan and tariffs the network-based functionalities for inmate payphones that are currently available to the Ameritech payphone entity (including, among other things, access to database services such as LIDB) and make them available on comparable terms to all payphone service providers.⁷

APCC also concurs⁸ (at 9) that Ameritech must clarify whether and how Ameritech's Independent Payphone Provider ("IPP") coin line service will be made available on a non-discriminatory basis to all payphone service providers.⁹ As APCC notes (at 9), if Ameritech is not

⁷ In addition, Ameritech's plan should also specify how customer information, including bad debt information, is provided to Ameritech's inmate payphone affiliate and how such information will be provided on a non-discriminatory basis to non-affiliates. See ICSPC at 11.

⁸ See AT&T at 3-4.

⁹ See, e.g., Ameritech's catalog for Indiana, Part 13, Section 2, Original Sheet No. 9, attached as Attachment A to Ameritech's CEI Plan.

required to disclose where its coin line service is unavailable, then Ameritech "would be in a position of providing coin line service to [its affiliate] while claiming that it is 'unavailable' to [independent payphone] providers." Therefore, Ameritech should be required to amend its CEI plan to state expressly that IPP coin line service will be available to non-Ameritech payphone service providers at every central office where such service is provided to Ameritech's payphone service affiliate.

Other similar concerns are also raised in the comments. For example, APCC points out that Ameritech has not only failed to consistently tariff "the basic payphone line" separately from network services and unbundled features, but it has not tarified the basic payphone line at the same rate for both coin line service and customer-owned coin operated telephones ("COCOT"), as required by the Reconsideration Order (para. 162). Ameritech should be required to include with its revised CEI plan state tariff pages that tariff the "basic payphone line" at the same rates for both coin line service and COCOT service.

Finally, APCC notes (at 15-16) that Ameritech's CEI plan also fails to address the Commission's requirement that LECs must provide transmission of codes that enable interexchange carriers to track payphone calls. Pursuant to the Reconsideration Order (para. 94), Ameritech must offer

services "that provide a discrete code to identify payphones that are maintained by non-LEC providers." The feature is critical to implementing per-call compensation, and Ameritech's CEI plan should provide detail on the types of codes it will offer to identify Ameritech payphones and the payphones of non-affiliated providers. Great Lakes concurs (at 21) that whatever codes Ameritech chooses to use, those codes should be transmitted for both IPP service and IPP coin line service, in order to prevent discrimination between users of the different services.¹⁰

¹⁰ In any event, whatever codes are used, the Reconsideration Order (para. 64) precludes Ameritech from requiring an interexchange carrier to perform an additional look-up in order to track payphone calls.


-6-

For the reasons stated above and in AT&T's initial comments, before Ameritech's CEI plan can be approved, Ameritech should be required to appropriately modify or clarify its plan consistent with the comments herein.

Respectfully submitted,

AT&T CORP.

By


Mark C. Rosenblum
Seth S. Gross

Its Attorneys

295 North Maple Avenue
Room 3250H3
Basking Ridge, New Jersey 07920
(908) 221-8312

January 17, 1997

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Rena Martens, do hereby certify that on this 17th day of January, 1997, a copy of the foregoing "AT&T's Reply Comments on Ameritech's Comparably Efficient Interconnection Plan" was mailed by U.S. first class mail, postage prepaid, to the parties shown on the attached service list.



Rena Martens

SERVICE LIST

Frank Michael Panek
Michael S. Pabian
Counsel for Ameritech
Room 4H84
2000 West Ameritech Center Drive
Hoffman Estates, IL 60196-1025

Albert H. Kramer
Robert F. Aldrich
David M. Janas
Dickstein Shapiro Morin
& Oshinsky LLP
2101 L Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-1526
Attorneys for the American
Public Communications
Council

Albert H. Kramer
Robert F. Aldrich
Dickstein Shapiro Morin
& Oshinsky LLP
2101 L Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-1526
Attorneys for the Inmate Calling
Service Providers Coalition

Michael W. Ward
John F. Ward, Jr.
Henry T. Kelly
O'Keefe, Ashenden, Lyons
and Ward
30 North LaSalle Street
Suite 4100
Chicago, IL 60602
Counsel for the Illinois Public
Telecommunications
Association

Bill Ralls
Butzel and Long
118 West Ottawa Street
Lansing, MI 48933
Counsel for the Michigan
Pay Telephone Association

Michael P. Erhard
Reinhart, Boerrr, Van Deuren
Norres & Rieselbach, S.C.
7617 Mineral Point Road
Madison, WI 53701-2020
Counsel for Wisconsin Public
Communications Association

Richard E. Aikman
Stewart & Irwin
251 E. Ohio
Suite 1100
Indianapolis, IN 46204
Counsel for the Indiana Payphone
Association

Andrew Phillips
Yares, Bauer, Ilinot
& Phillips, S.C.
141 North Sayer Street
P. O. Box 1338
Oshkosh, WI 54902-1338
Counsel for the Wisconsin
Pay Telephone Association

Janice Myles*
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications
Commission
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

ITS*
2100 M Street, N.W.
Room 140
Washington, D.C. 20037

* Hand Delivery